

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to an Office action mailed March 30, 2006. Applicant would like to thank Examiner Shaw for the courtesy and clarity shown during the telephone interview on April 28, 2006. During the interview, the Applicant noted the key differences between the invention and the device disclosed in the cited Ayd patent. Amendments to overcome rejections were discussed and are reflected herein.

The major basis of the rejections are noted in the Examiner's Response to Arguments 6.a in the Office Action, is summarized here:

"The invention is on reducing space and electric complexity. Ayd's invention is particularly directed to these objectives" and "Whether the exact components are contained in the units ... are not the invention".

Applicant respectfully disagrees with these assertions. The first sentence of the BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION is repeated here:

"It is the object of the present invention to provide economy of space and reduce system complexity by *coupling the disk drive and the CPU subsystem together into one unit that is compatible with standard disk drive mounting hardware and enclosures.*" (emphasis added)

The fact that the present invention and Ayd's invention are both directed toward similar objectives has nothing to do with whether the claimed invention is anticipated by Ayd. On the contrary, it is clear that Ayd in no way discloses or suggests the key fundamental concept of the claimed invention which is emphasized above. This is the formation of a disk drive and CPU subsystem assembly that is compatible with standard disk drive mounting hardware and enclosures and clearly distinguishes the claimed invention over Ayd, for reasons that are apparent from the following remarks.

With specific reference to rejections set forth in the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ayd et.al (US 6,025,989 A). In addition, claims 3, 5, 10, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ayd in view of Savage. Finally, claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ayd in view of Mazingo. All of these rejections are hereby traversed in view of the amendments to claims 1, 8 and 15 and the arguments set forth below.

To further distinguish the claimed invention over Ayd and at the suggestion of Examiner Shaw, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have each been amended to specify a "standard disk drive" over "disk drive" and to clarify that the CPU subsystem housing, which conforms to the same height and width of the disk drive, is sized and configured such that the combined CPU subsystem housing/disk drive assembly can be secured in a standard single disk drive enclosure of a computer housing. Clearly, Ayd does not anticipate any of claims 1, 8 and 15 as amended because 1) there is no disclosure in Ayd. of a CPU subsystem having a height and width the same as that of one of the disk drives 16 or 17; 2) there is no disclosure in Ayd of a CPU subsystem mechanically secured to one of the disk drives 16 or 17; and, 3) there is no disclosure in Ayd of a disk drive/CPU subsystem assembly that can be secured in a standard disk drive enclosure of a personal computer or the like. On the contrary, Ayd describes two chassis that conform to each other, however, none of them conforms to the size of a standard disk drive.

Further still, by specifying a standard disk drive, the present invention can, by definition, be accommodated by industry standard mounting hardware and enclosures for standard disk drives, manufactured by many companies. Standard drive mounting hardware is typically composed of brackets and metal stampings that specifically accommodate the height and width

dimensions of the disk drive, yet the length is typically not constrained in order to allow room for cabling. An example can be found inside of a typical personal computer where there is usually a disk drive bay containing a tray or brackets specifically sized for disk drives. The width of the mounting hardware accommodates the width of the disk drive, and the height is standardized to allow stacking of a few disk drives within the hardware. The claimed invention is specifically designed to take advantage of the extra normally unused length that is typically available in the disk drive bay of a typical PC. This concept is nowhere disclosed in Ayd.

Further, Applicant would like to reiterate the point that the chassis 14 in Ayd is not a disk drive, but is a chassis that supports 2 disk drives and other components, as clearly illustrated. From the disclosure in Ayd, it is clear that the CPU housing is much larger in cross section than a standard disk drive and is not approximately the same height and width as the disk drive as recited in the claims. In addition, the claims also recite that electrical connectors are provided that mate to one another so that power and/or data can be fed between the CPU subsystem and the disk drive without the need for external cabling. Clearly, Ayd does not disclose or suggest such an arrangement in which a single disk drive is mated to a CPU subsystem. Instead, Ayd discloses a CPU subsystem that is mated to a logic chassis, in which are disposed numerous items including two disk drives and their housings. The CPU subsystem is coupled to the removable chassis, not to one of the disk drives. If anything then, Ayd actually teaches away from the inventive concept.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8 and 15 as amended are clearly patentable and allowable over Ayd and the other prior art of record. Further, for the same reasons, the various other rejections of the dependent claims that

are set forth in the Office Action are also overcome. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /William A. Blake/  
William A. Blake, Reg. No.30,548  
(filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.34 on behalf of Joel  
R. Williams)

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2266, Eads Station  
Arlington, VA. 22202  
(703) 415-1500  
Dated: June 30, 2006